

### **Remarks**

Claims 2-12, 18-22, 30-36 and 51-56 are pending in the application. Claims 30, 36, 51, 53 and 56 are amended by this amendment. Withdrawn claims 13-17, 23-29, and 37-50 cancelled by this amendment. By an Office Action mailed on November 17, 2005, claims 1-12 and 18-22 are allowed, and claims 30-36 and 50-56 stand rejected.

### **Amendments to the Specification**

Applicant submits a substitute specification as requested by the Examiner. Enclosed is a marked-up substitute specification showing all changes to the specification relative to the immediate prior version of the specification of record. Also enclosed is a clean version without markings. The substitute specification contains no new matter.

The Examiner objected to the amendment of 1/24/2005 describing methods including the steps of pulling certain drive members and simultaneously slackening other drive members. When a patent application discloses a device that inherently performs a function or has a property, operates according to a theory or has an advantage, a patent application necessarily discloses that function, theory or advantage, even though it says nothing explicit concerning it. The application may later be amended to recite the function, theory or advantage without introducing prohibited new matter. *In re Reynolds*, 443 F.2d 384, 170 USPQ 94 (CCPA 1971). In the method steps previously disclosed, slackening of the other drive members is inherent under many operating configurations of the present invention. However, Applicant recognizes that “slackening” has more than one definition and therefore might be ambiguous under some circumstances.

Paragraphs [0008.61] and [0008.62] have been amended to change “slackening” to “reversing” to avoid ambiguity that may be construed as new matter. Reversing is well supported in the specification as filed. For example, in Figure 4, when sprocket 70 rotates as discussed in Paragraph [0070], while sprocket 70 pulls drive member a, drive member j simultaneously and necessarily moves in the reverse direction. Likewise in Figure 13, when sprocket 70 rotates as discussed in Paragraph [0082], while sprocket 70 pulls drive section 3, drive section 1 simultaneously and necessarily moves in the reverse direction.

The Examiner objected to phraseology in the Abstract. A replacement Abstract is provided.

The Examiner objected to disclosure because of informalities in paragraphs [0050] and [0056]. These two paragraphs have been amended to correct the informalities.

### **Amendments to the Claims**

The Examiner objected to claims 30-36 because the Examiner did not find support in the specification for methods including the steps of pulling certain drive members and simultaneously slackening other drive members. As discussed above, when a patent application discloses a device that inherently performs a function or has a property, operates according to a theory or has an advantage, a patent application necessarily discloses that function, theory or advantage, even though it says nothing explicit concerning it.

Claims 30 and 36 are currently amended to overcome Examiner's objection. Amended claims 30 and 36 change "slackening" to "reversing" to avoid ambiguity that may be construed as new matter. Reversing is well supported in the specification as filed. For example, in Figure 4, when sprocket 70 rotates as discussed in Paragraph [0070], while sprocket 70 pulls drive member a, drive member j simultaneously and necessarily moves in the reverse direction. Likewise in Figure 13, when sprocket 70 rotates as discussed in Paragraph [0082], while sprocket 70 pulls drive section 3, drive section 1 simultaneously and necessarily moves in the reverse direction.

Claims 51-52 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Blodgett Jr. The Examiner found that Anderson disclosed the claimed inventions other than a lock, which the Examiner finds in Blodgett, Jr.

Claims 53-56 stand rejected as being anticipated by Anderson. Under the "all elements" rule, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently, in one prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Anderson discloses an expanding camp trailer comprising flexible drive members to facilitate extending and retracting the expanding portions. However, Anderson discloses a different mechanism than the present invention.

Anderson discloses a set of flexible driving members attached to each side of the extending room, Anderson reference numbers 10", 19, and 32. However, the driver in Anderson

engages drive member 24. The Anderson driver is operatively connected to drive member 10" through tackle 14 and drive member 24, but the driver clearly is not operatively connected to drive members 19 or 32. Further, Anderson drive member 32 is not attached to the sides of the expanding room, but the bottom.

Claims 51, 53, and 56 are currently amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection. As amended, claims 51, 53, and 56 describe the driving members fixed by anchors as being operatively connected to a driver.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request prompt allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,  
Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP

Date: February 17, 2006

  
Michael H. Minns  
Reg. No. 31,985

Hahn Loeser + Parks, LLP  
One GOJO Plaza  
Suite 300  
Akron, Ohio 44311-1076  
(330) 864-5550